

## Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on June 30, 2006. The applicant, Thomas J. Massingill is, as of this response, represented by a licensed practitioner, Donald R. Boys, Registration No. 35,074. In the action immediately referred to, the Examiner has made several references to the vague and ambiguous nature of the claims, and has issued rejections, saying "...as the claims are best understood". This is clearly because the applicant has not had the experience of several years in drafting claims, and is not intimately familiar with USPTO practice. Accordingly all of the presently-standing claims have been cancelled by amendment above, and new claims entered to clarify that believed by the inventor to be the patentable subject matter.

The new claims are consistent in subject matter, but perhaps not in scope, with the cancelled claims, and are therefore drawn to the same invention as were the cancelled claims. The applicant and the agent apologize for the sudden shift, but both believe the examination will now proceed more smoothly; and trust the Examiner will agree.

As to the objection to the drawings as not showing all features of the claims, that objection is moot, as claims 1-19 are now cancelled. The applicant believes all of the features of new claims 32-51 are shown in the as-filed figures. As to the objection to the drawings stating that 100b is defined in Fig. 4 as a via, but is not directed to a via, the applicant and his newly-appointed agent have reviewed Fig. 4, and it does not appear that Fig. 4, or any of the other figures, have any text defining element numbers with names, and the witness line for element 100b goes to an adhesion layer, and the element number is used in the text of the as-filed specification also as an adhesion layer. So the applicant believes this objection is in error, and requests that the Examiner clarify, if necessary, in the next communication.

As to the merit rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), partly because the claims have been completely redrafted, and are considerably altered from the as-filed claims, the

applicant believes the new claims are patentable over the art cited and applied, and respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Thomas Joel Massingill

By Donald R. Boys  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
(831) 768-1755